RATES

Annual Subscription	Rs.	6 0
Half-Yearly	Rs.	3 8
Quarterly	Rs.	2 0
Foreign		14s.

CONTRIBUTIONS submitted for publication should be type-written, with at least double space between the lines, and only on one side of the paper.

The Dawn

DELHI

Sunday, January 11, 1942.

THE UNHOLY CHORUS

Incoherency of the chorus apart, whether it be Nehru, Gandhi, C. R., Savarkar or Sapru, the burden of their songs is the same—that Britain should forthwith commit herself to the effect that the sub-continent of India is one homogeneous ***country***, inhabitted entirely by one Indian ***nation*** and is, therefore, indivisible, and that she should, on that basis, give a categorical promise to concede the freedom of the ***country*** at the end of the war and at the moment undertake provisional settlement as an earnest of their promise. So, that is the impossible price of Congress cooperation in war efforts, which they expect to extort from Britain under the stress of the war. The latest to join the band is the misguided British Press, led by their ***Guardian***.

The Congress represents a people—not the Muslims—who, according to history, have never ventured out of this sub-continent and have almost always surrendered to or got beaten and subjugated by foreign invaders and have, therefore, little accumulated experience of statecraft in peace or war. To appease such a people at the cost of those who have been the rulers of this sub-continent before the advent of the British, for more than seven centuries, and whose brethren-in-faith are still ruling, for more than a thousand years now, parts of Asia, Africa and Europe and fighting side by side with Britain, cannot be justified even on the grounds of expediency, let alone justice and fairplay. But if Britain must continue to bungle even at this critical stage of the war, she can please herself.

Democracy or no democracy, Indian Musalmans are not going to submit to Hindu domination, in spite of British bayonets. If freedom is to come it must benefit all the different peoples inhabitting this sub-continent and not only the Hindus who, being in a minority in no less than six provinces (the Punjab, the N.-W.F.P., Baluchistan, Sindh, Assam and Bengal) nevertheless happen to be the majority in the "administrative phantom," called India, taken as a whole. The Muslims, on their part, have known freedom better than those whom the Congress claims to represent.

Knowing that Britain is not going to "get out", in spite of Jawaharlals, the Congress is harking back to Britain for a declaration in favour of the Hindus, to the exclusion of other claimants. Let Britain, by all means, concede or even "confer" freedom now and here or whenever she so pleases. But that freedom shall not be conceded unless the claims of the different peoples to independent homelands in the sub-continent have ***first*** been determined and adjusted to the satisfaction of all concerned. Only then can freedom come to stay. What is required is not the freedom of ***the*** country or ***the*** nation —for, there is no one nation or one homogeneous country —but the freedom of each one of the homogeneous zones of the Indian sub-continent.

If Britain has not the courage to give a "categorical promise" to that effect, she has equally no moral justification to commit herself, contrary to the solemn pledge of August 1940, to a course of action detrimental to the interests of all but the Hindus —100 million Muslims and nearly as many millions of the scheduled classes, which makes a total of nearly half the population of the Indian sub-continent. If, again, she cannot muster courage, for fear of the Hindus, to do justice by the peoples who together make up nearly half the population of this sub-continent, let her clear out, as suggested by Mr. Jawaharlal, leaving the peoples free to settle things between themselves. But if, on the contrary, she chooses to appease the Hindus, as represented by the Congress and allied organisations, regardless of the cost or consequences, she will reap as she will sow.

NOTES

Pakistan For Peace

Referring to Pakistan Sir Bijoy Parshad in his Presidential address at the 23rd annual session of the National Liberal Federation says that it is a challenge to the fundamental unity running through the whole continent of India, it is a repudiation of the unity of purpose which underlies the external multitudinous ramifications of society, it encourages an attitude towards life where emphasis is placed on differences and incompatibilities in scorn of the impulse of cohesion. Such a scheme leaves societv open to the assaults of chaos and anarchy.

It shows Sir B. Parshad lives in unrealities and refuses to understand the Pakistan scheme. As a matter of fact there does not exist any fundamental unity in the country to which Pakistan is a challenge. There is only an artificial unity invented by the rulers for their administrative convenience which has developed into a great menace to the existence of 100 million Muslims inhabitting the sub-continent. Pakistan is there to meet that exigency. India is inhabitted by peoples of different nationalities who have nothing in common between themselves, despite close contact of centuries past. The external ramification of society is the mirror of the internal conditions where there is no unity of purpose between different peoples.

Pakistan stands for establishment of national homes of all the peoples in the sub-continent of India—Hindus, Muslims and scheduled classes. Once the scheme materialises it would obviate all chances of chaos and anarchy in society. In fact the scheme is a sure guarantee of justice and fairplay to all and peace and harmony all over the sub-continent. Those who talk in different terms either misunderstand or deliberately misrepresent it.

The Assam Affair

The resignation of Mr. Rohini Kumar-Chaudhury, the Education Minister in Sir Sa'adullah Cabinet, neces-

(Continued on next page)